

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of INDIA BURNS-VANN, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LAPREEA VANN,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

BERNARD BURNS,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

July 7, 2000

No. 222061

Macomb Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 97-043790-NA

Before: Jansen, P. J., and Hood and Saad, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the family court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm.

The family court did not abuse its discretion by denying the request to adjourn the termination proceedings. *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 28; 501 NW2d 182 (1993). Respondent-appellant did not appear at the proceedings, she failed to notify either the court or counsel of any reason for her absence, and she had missed five previous hearings as well.

Next, the record amply demonstrates that petitioner made reasonable efforts to allow respondent-appellant to stabilize her life and regain custody of her child. Respondent-appellant simply failed to benefit from the opportunities that were provided to her. Thus, the family court's finding that

reasonable efforts were made to reunite respondent-appellant with the minor child is not clearly erroneous.

Finally, the family court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Indeed, only one statutory ground for termination is required, *In re Huisman*, 230 Mich App 372, 384-385; 584 NW2d 349 (1998), and respondent-appellant does not address the family court's determination that § 19b(3)(g) was met by clear and convincing evidence. Respondent-appellant's failure to address the court's decision to terminate under § 19b(3)(g) constitutes an abandonment of this issue. *In re JS & SM*, 231 Mich App 92, 98-99; 585 NW2d 326 (1998). Further, respondent-appellant failed to come forward with evidence that termination of her parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Boursaw*, 239 Mich App 161, 179-180; 607 NW2d 408 (1999). Thus, the family court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the child. *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997).

Affirmed.

/s/ Kathleen Jansen

/s/ Harold Hood

/s/ Henry William Saad